

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims have been neither amended nor canceled. Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0015070) in view of Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,774).

Regarding claims 1, and 11, the Office Action concedes that Taylor et al. fails to disclose "head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer heads." However, the Office Action asserts that Okamoto discloses "head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer heads." (Figures 4-5; Column 10, lines 36-41) Further, the Office Action sets forth Taylor et al. discloses "slider to slide with respect to the head caps, and having wipers to wipe the printer heads and spittoons (48) to remove ink from the printer heads (Abstract; Column 4, lines 39-53)"

By way of review, FIG. 4 of Taylor et al. shows wiper 150 but fail to disclose "a slider to slide with respect to the head caps, and having wipers mounted on a front end portion thereof "as recited in claim 1. Further, the Examiner asserts that Taylor et al. discloses all of the claimed structure as recited in claim 1 except disclose "head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer and Okamoto discloses head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer. As mentioned above, Taylor et al. fails to disclose "head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer" recited invention in claim 1. Although Okamoto discloses "head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer", this reference is not cited for and does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Taylor et al. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that neither Taylor et al. nor Okamoto, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest how to combine the features as recited in claim 1.

Claim 11, which includes at least similar recitations to those of claim 1, is submitted to be allowable for at least similar reasons to those of claim 1, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 9, and 10 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from claim 1.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0015070) as modified by Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,774) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Park (U.S. Pub. 2003/0090535).

As noted by the Examiner in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, Park et al. appears to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)(1). In addition, it is noted that Park et al. was commonly owned with the instant application at the time the invention of the instant application was made. Under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), "[s]ubject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." MPEP 2146, EXAMINATION GUIDELINES FOR 35 U.S.C. 102(E), AS AMENDED BY THE AMERICAN INVENTORS PROTECTION ACT OF 1999, AND FURTHER AMENDED BY THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND HIGH TECHNOLOGY TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2002, AND 35 U.S.C. 102(G), 1266 OG 77 (January 14, 2003). As such, it is respectfully submitted that Park is not available as prior art for use in an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0015070) as modified by Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,774) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,203,136).

Claims 6 and 8 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from claim 1.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0015070) as modified by Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,774) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Park (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0090535).

As mentioned above, Park is not qualified as a prior art. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 17 and 18 should be withdrawn and claims 17 and 18 should be allowed.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0015070) as modified by Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,774) and Park (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0090535) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Miyauchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,749).

As mentioned above, Park is not qualified as a prior art. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 19-21 should be withdrawn and claims 19-21 should be allowed.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Aug 5, 2014

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Gene M. Garner, II  
Registration No. 34,172

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501